



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

17555 Peak Avenue Morgan Hill CA 95037 (408) 779-7247 Fax (408) 779-7236
Website Address: www.morgan-hill.ca.gov

PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING AND WORKSHOP MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING & WORKSHOP

January 29, 2008

PRESENT: Acevedo, Koepp-Baker, Benich, Davenport, Escobar, Mueller, Tanda

ABSENT: None

LATE: None

STAFF: Community Development Director (CDD) Molloy-Previsich,
Planning Manager (PM) Rowe, and Minutes Clerk Johnson.

Chair Escobar called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. and led the flag salute.

DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA

Minutes Clerk Johnson certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

With no members of the audience indicating a wish to speak to matters not appearing on the agenda, Chair Escobar opened, and then closed, the public comment period.

MINUTES:

JANUARY 8,
2008

COMMISSIONERS MUELLER/DAVENPORT MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 8, 2008 MINUTES WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

Page 2, paragraph 7: are we circumventing intent of prior actions? In terms of commercial uses – indoor – *what is contemplated in terms of recreating uses?* the kinds of uses contemplated about three years ago, e.g., *we discussed* convenience stores; ~~now~~ *however we* can't have convenience stores within proximity of schools in and **Page 3, top of page:** ~~this it proposed~~ *are to allow* arcade *centers* with sales of retail objects ~~outlets found at~~ *such as* convenience stores

Page 4, paragraph 8: Chair Escobar interjected, "An arcade would be compatible ~~because of the Soccer Fields and the Aquatic Center.~~"

Page 4, paragraph 10:could cause *delay and* waiting...

Page 6, 1st full paragraph, bullets 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8:

- part of question: ~~whether revenue issue talks about of other businesses (wine tasting, etc) might have been reasonable to think of those uses~~ *is whether the focus of generating revenue or limiting the use to draw from the freeway*

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2008

PAGE 2

- issue (from his prospective): if revenue generation is most important, then *the attention should be given* ~~can to enable~~ the City *to* attract businesses on ~~that~~ *those* sites
- 2nd story use:....very few retail ~~and those not~~ *on secondary stories are* generally successful; people are not attracted to 2nd story retail unless the location is a very *high* urban center
- a convenience store might be good for residents and visitors and meet needs *of those drawn to the Soccer Fields and the Aquatic Center*
- thinks this site provides better grouping of businesses for additional revenue - ~~more than~~ *and does not draw away from* downtown

Page 7, 1st paragraph: ... agreeing *to* look

Page 8, paragraph 5: Commissioner Tanda urged that the CIP be considered as a 20-year plan with the annual (5-year) CIP as an increment of the 20-year plan.

Commissioner Tanda urged consideration of a 20-year capital fiscal plan with the annual (5-year) CIP as an increment of the 20-year plan.

THE MOTION PASSED (7-0) BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: ACEVEDO, KOEPP-BAKER, BENICH, DAVENPORT, ESCOBAR, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: NONE; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: NONE.

PUBLIC HEARING:

1) REVIEW OF FINAL SCORING OF THE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SYSTEM (RDCS) APPLICATIONS FOR THE FY 2009-10 MICRO PROJECT COMPETITION AND DOWNTOWN MEASURE F OPEN MARKET COMPETITION

PM Rowe gave the staff report with a overview of the application screening process as completed this year, including:

- the following four categories which contained global issue adjustments
- School District: commitments by other project developers >> no adjustment
- Orderly and Contiguous/Lot Layout: need for interface connection; common Open Space with pedestrian availability
- Natural and Environmental: letter received at this meeting for clarification of minimal grading [1 project downtown in flood plain so need more than two feet—subtraction of 1 point 9>8 points (Engineer Bill McClintock to address)]
- clarification of projects with tie scores: City Code states ties are limited to first round only; ultimately with reevaluation and scoring adjustments, only one project had highest score
- Livable Communities (project excellence give by Commissioners)
- use of 8 rather than the total (whole)14 categories
- appeal process / how Council may have differences for scoring recommendations

PM Rowe addressed the issue of Sherman House (MF: 07-01), the project in which the City has an interest as a possible-purchase property. He said it appears the City has intention of operating with an RFP if the purchase is completed. In response to questions raised at the last Commission meeting regarding a potential for conflict for City employees working on the evaluation of the application. The City Attorney had been asked to review the matter of potential conflict. PM Rowe noted that while the City Attorney could have issued a report, she had decided to consult with an independent Counsel staff for a report. The Attorney reported that employees who worked for the City, and evaluated the proposal did not represent conflict on the basis of receiving a salary. Further, it had been determined that if the City had made application process and private entity was vying for the same number of allocations then fair and impartial third party could be asked to conduct the evaluation and

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2008

PAGE 3

subsequent scoring. It had been stated in the report from the independent Counsel: even though Sherman House may become a City project within a month there did not appear to be a conflict on the current application.

Commissioner Benich asked for further clarification for adjustments on the E Dunne-Leung application, querying if all 14 categories had been applied? Commissioner Mueller reminded that the point system scoring prescribed by Code.

Commissioner Mueller referenced Mr. McClintock's letter raising the issue in MMC-07-03 (questioning storm drainage) which raised the score of the Public Facilities, by one point.

Noting that public hearings would be opened on the projects to which Mr. McClintock was anticipated to speak, Chair Escobar opened the public hearing.

Note: Bill McClintock, MH Engineering, 15410 Oak Grove Ave., was present to speak to

MMC-07-02, -03, and -04. Other speakers are so noted.

MMC-07-02: (Mr. McClintock)

- asked for one additional point in Schools {Safe Crossings} referenced the installation on Central Ave. with flashing lights and a crosswalk
- objected to 'subjectiveness' of Lot Layout; letter submitted regarding arguments considered at last meeting

MMC-07-03:

Mr. McClintock asked for one more point in Public Facilities; applicant had filed application in downtown competition and was awarded point for storm drain; now evaluators looking at differently; has agree not to agree with Public Works; Mr. McClintock told the Commissioners, "I think the controversy of maintenance of storm drain may keep developers from putting those facilities into adjacent lots. In the past when we have gone through the process, we got this point and were not subsequently told of a potentially different interpretation. Now that the Planning Commission has said that in the future competitions would be scored differently, the 'fair thing' to do would be to give the point now and give notice that that category being scored differently in the future. I think that the subcommittee should alert developers of these differences."

MMC-07-04:

Mr. McClintock noted this project is points behind following the scoring of first eight categories. "These applicants spending \$12,000 for the application; that is practically the same as the amount for Open Market competition. These three micro projects are similar, with good quality. There are only three allocations in 2009-10. When the City gets the population forecast from the CA Finance Department I think there will be more allocations available, probably about 15. I recommend that you do not make findings for the applications at this time, but wait. When the information goes to the Council if you wait, you have the figures and probably make allocations for all the project applications. These are small projects and can be able to build sooner rather than later. These projects could even trade for allocations in the 2008-09 year. The bigger projects can't be built for 2008-09 even if they get allocations. These applicants could approach the City to trade allocations for sooner development. I would hate to

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2008

PAGE 4

see an applicant have to come back having spent \$12,000 this year,” Mr. McClintock said, as he again advocated waiting for the Finance Department report to the City in March.

Commissioner Mueller led discussion regarding the Schools/Safe Walking Route topic, with Mr. McClintock raising the following issues:

- signalization availability (2c)
- definition: safe route
- committee needs to look at category

Commissioner Mueller also asked for discussion of Public Facilities (sewer drains construction; infill project does not construct). Mr. McClintock said he was aware that projects had gotten points for this in numerous competitions and this evaluation was confusing. “You need to look at the intent. This way the City would have ease of maintenance,” he said. “Developers will put in storm drains that aren’t needed just to get the point. We need to look at the intent of the criteria.”

Responding to the concern of ‘change of interpretation without notification’

Chair Escobar asked PM Rowe for clarification. “Has there been a change not announced?” he asked. PM Rowe responded that he did not recall notification of the issue during orientation. PM Rowe continued by saying, “No, we not notify of different methodology but in 2006 it was discussed and it appears we did score differently for this competition.” The Commissioners discussed the concern that there may have been a change in scoring methodology without public announcement. PM Rowe advised the applications were exactly the same as those had been two years ago.

The issue of a tie score was raised. PM Rowe was asked to clarify the matter, which he did by reading from the Code regarding the matter. It was clearly understood that further evaluative scoring would only relate to the tie score of the top two applications. Commissioner Mueller explained to Mr. McClintock that a concern was with the tie score of the eight evaluated categories (MMC-07-02 and 03), then examining the remaining six categories could result in different scores being awarded.

Mr. McClintock also addressed the issue of the project (MMC-07-02) wherein the application indicated an amount of fill not previously considered, saying the applicant had known the additional fill would be required.

Thomas Rose, 17321 El Rancho Ave., Monte Serrano, addressed the Commissioners, saying he was the owner of the property for MMC-07-04, and distributed a written document, highlighting - from his perspective - what the applicants were trying to achieve. Mr. Rose listed several factors including:

- the functional design features were to encourage expand family living
- extension of Morgan Hill standards
- efficiency, green standards
- design complementary of surrounding area
- consistency with criteria

Commissioner Benich explained the need for consistency of categories and advised that the City may want to change something in the future.

Sylvia Leung, 968 Hanson Ct., spoke to the Commissioners regarding:

- request for additional points (some of which she said she thought had been granted at the previous meeting); Commissioners discussed this issue at length

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2008

PAGE 5

regarding the Livable Communities category, with PM Rowe clarifying that additional points in this category pertained only to Downtown competitions; the rationale for scoring eight instead of 14 categories was also discussed with staff explanation

- questions of application fee (specifically: why do Micro applicants have to pay more than larger projects)

Commissioner Mueller announced that at the last meeting, one of first discussions started with the projects that had tied, so this one was not re-scored. He went on to explain that

Lot Layout was not scored in the initial eight categories as this was just ‘a standard Micro Measure application and by Code could only get nine points.

Commissioner Tanda reminded that the Commissioners and applicants that it appears a winner for Measure C actually had to go through six screenings and said he thought it would be good if the process was made clear as developers may be mistaken with a belief that they can compete at level 5 or 6 but may have been screened out.

With no others present to address the issues raised or comment further on the matter, the public hearing was closed.

Note: Commissioner Acevedo asked that the discussion and vote for the projects begin with the Micro allocations as he would be stepping down following the decision on those applications due to a potential for conflict of interest. The Chair decreed the request granted.

Commissioners observed: it appears true that Micro applicants are paying more than Open Competition applicants; PM Rowe explained if the same or lesser than available numbers of allocations are available, costs are generally the same. But when a competition creates additional costs, the Micros tend to be slightly higher. “This has been noted for the subcommittee to discuss,” PM Rowe said. “One of things we will be doing later this year, Development Services will be moving to the old library site. We will find time to discuss and make recommendations to the subcommittee on how the whole competition process can be streamlined and done more efficiently. The current application fees may not make sense, but the fee schedule was approved by Council and we will be looking at it. Commissioner Benich commented he felt it should be given priority. PM Rowe advised that the original intent of looking at only eight of the fourteen categories for Micros would be less costly and take less time. Chair Escobar remarked, “It seems we may have consumed savings in time that we had sought to gain.”

Commissioner Tanda asked clarification of the Schools category relating to MMC-07-02 (Malech). PM Rowe read from page 7 of the staff report: b2c wherein a traffic stop is required; he pointed out that at the last meeting that although a flashing light is in place and a cross walk present, traffic on Central Ave. does not stop.

Commissioner Mueller said brought up the Public Facilities issues of MMC-07-03 (Latala) “We must achieve consistency in the process. If we gave a point in the past and this reads the same - even if it is right or wrong – we have to be consistent. We need to change wording in this section,” he said. PM Rowe advised that additional

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2008

PAGE 6

points were given for Public Facilities for both the Latala and Leung. Commissioner Davenport remarked that if MMC-07-03 (Leung) did not get allocations this year, and the criteria changes, then the application might not get a point next year. Chair Escobar urged that the Commissioners not be prejudicial for next year, but consider criteria for next year.

Commissioner Mueller noted that if the Planning Commission gives the points during discussion following evaluation, then the application must be rescored.

COMMISSIONERS MUELLER/BENICH MOTIONED TO ADJUST THE REGULAR SCORING FOR THE MICRO APPLICATIONS AS FOLLOWS:

	Public Facilities	Landscaping	Orderly & Contiguous	Total
MMC-07-02		7 >> 7.5		158.5
MMC-07-03	9>>10	7 >> 7.5	17<<18	158.5
MMC-07-04	9>>10			155

Commissioners discussed:

- scoring in each of the categories was for the indicated projects
- schools [safe walking distance] (no change)
- three units only were available for allocation in the Micro category
- lack of willingness to consider other points in the various categories based on current criteria

THE MOTION PASSED (6-1) BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: ACEVEDO, KOEPP-BAKER, BENICH, ESCOBAR, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: DAVENPORT, who said his reasons for opposition had been demonstrated by staff with the current process to be confusing. "I had been honored to be part of a member of a subcommittee (study group) of the Planning Commission to review process and this is not what I had hoped would occur"; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: NONE.

The Commissioners then turned to the Commissioners Point for Excellence. During Commission discussion, the following points were raised: need to award the Point for Excellence because of the tie score (following adjustments to the points at this meeting

PM Rowe advised that if all categories were scored, MMC-07-03 (Latala) would be ahead by one point.

The voting process was discussed (superior and super superior vote). PM Rowe was asked to give an overview of project capabilities of the developers.

Chair Escobar conducted the vote for the projects, with the following results:

MMC-07-02	0 votes
MMC-07-03	1 vote each by Commissioners: Koepp-Baker, Benich, Davenport, and Escobar

Consequently, MMC-07-04 received 2 points to be added to the Livable Communities category for a total score of 7 points with the total point score for that application of

160.

COMMISSIONER MUELLER OFFERED A RESOLUTION APPROVING FINAL AMENDED PROJECT SCORES IN THE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SYSTEM MICRO PROJECT COMPLETION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2009-10 BUILDING ALLOTMENT, WITH THE MODIFICATIONS AGREED DURING DISCUSSION. NOTING THE FINDINGS CONTAINED THEREIN, COMMISSIONER BENICH OFFERED THE SECOND TO THE MOTION.

Commissioner Tanda asked for a recap of superior and super superior scoring.

Commissioner Davenport repeated opposition to the Resolution, with the objection being based on his concern with the lack of criteria consistency.

THE MOTION PASSED (6-1) BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: ACEVEDO, KOEPP-BAKER, BENICH, ESCOBAR, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: DAVENPORT; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: NONE.

Commissioner Acevedo announced that he would be stepping down due to a potential for conflict of interest as he has a business/property within 500 feet of the Sherman House project, being further conflicted with the Downtown Plan (workshop scheduled to follow the MF-07-01) discussion and vote. Consequently, Commissioner Acevedo was excused at 7:30 p.m.

PM Rowe advised that MF-07-01 was judged with 'simpler criteria' and had received a score of 161, just one point above the minimum.

Chair Escobar opened, and then closed the public hearing as there were no persons present to address the matter.

Commissioner Mueller reported that he was aware of concerns from members of the public regarding the architecture of the current structure. "I know it would not affect the scoring, but since the RDA will own that building and that site, hopefully they will listen," he said.

COMMISSIONER MUELLER OFFERED A RESOLUTION APPROVING FINAL AMENDED PROJECT SCORES IN THE DOWNTOWN MEASURE F PROJECT COMPLETION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2009-10 BUILDING ALLOTMENT, WITH THE MODIFICATIONS AGREED DURING DISCUSSION. NOTING THE FINDINGS CONTAINED THEREIN, COMMISSIONER KOEPP-BAKER OFFERED THE SECOND TO THE MOTION.

Commissioner Tanda asked that the record show that two articles for scoring RCDS applications would receive further study by the subcommittee:

- storm drains and signalization topics
- all categories would be scored with no differentiation

Commissioner Mueller observed that if the Commissioners were to look at all 14 categories, it could be very expensive. He suggested that the Commissions might want

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2008

PAGE 8

to consider another of the categories for looking at infill. PM Rowe advised that following each RCDS competition, there must be subcommittee to consider items for next competition. "This time the subcommittee will be looking at some items from the joint meeting with the City Council and some from discussions during this process, the scoring criteria will be coming back to a future Commission meeting," PM Rowe said.

THE MOTION PASSED (5-1-0-1) with THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: KOEPP-BAKER, BENICH, ESCOBAR, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: DAVENPORT; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: ACEVEDO.

WORKSHOP:

WORKSHOP ON THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN AND PARKING MANAGEMENT STRATEGY; AND SCOPING SESSION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)

CDD Molloy-Previsich introduced members of the consultant team who had been working on various aspects of the preliminary Downtown Specific Plan and parking management strategy / scoping session for environmental impact report (EIR):

- Mark Spencer, DRS Associates, Oakland
- Louis Hexter, MG, Inc, Berkeley
- Jonathan Schuppert, San Jose
- Bruce Johnston, Danville

CDD Molloy-Previsich explained that the task was to take a look at preliminary draft specific plan which is anticipated to replace the 2003 Downtown Plan. The work done here is intended to be a general plan as well as a zoning plan. "This includes infrastructure needs, and provides a level of how public improvements will be financed," she said. "As to the 'nuts and bolts, we will be considering:

- the boundary
- if a larger Specific Plan might be needed
- content of the specific plan update from the 2003 Down plan
- vision statement developed by the Task Force: uses and strategy more friendly and pedestrian use place
- land use
- circulation
- parking strategies / Ordinance has been adopted for parking waivers
- and finally, an implementation plan

Continuing, CDD Molloy-Previsich said the updating was occurring because:

- some things need to be refined
- some things have been implemented
- housing
 - mixed use
 - rezoning

CDD Molloy-Previsich reminded of the boundaries of the Downtown Plan and said, "A lot has gone on which will last 4 - 5 years and now we see more need for strategy to plan where to go." She also noted that the RDA funding had been extended with a commitment of \$40 million in the Downtown area. We see a need for better regulation for commercial and good placement of residential. Height adjustment may be necessary for residential.

CDD Molloy-Previsich maintained that parking management is now a realistic

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2008

PAGE 9

forecast with the potential for having Monterey Road become two lanes rather than four.

This plan indicates more aggression for 2 lanes and we will be studying that actively. "The Negative Declaration was based on limited development. Now with the projected development we are having an EIR clearance for that development rather than relying on the Neg Dec," she said.

Noting key changes:

- CBD (Central Business District) be established
- intensive and density floor area ratio: regulation density and scale of density
- density increase from 18 to 20
- identification of other opportunity sites
- downtown core density: regulating thru density and height
- more concerns of scale and mass
- retail zoning overlays to be reworked: how much retail to be required or asking
- residential density control system measure to be on an upcoming ballot (RCDS doesn't work for attached high density projects)
- downtown *is* the City and 'smart growth' says fill in rather than expand City boundaries
- assess what downtown made project of what might be realistically projected
- consideration of retail, restaurant, and office space, residential
- commercial development standards
- recommended rate at how parking spaces need to allocated: parking appears now in balance with growth to 2015 with rapid accelerate thereafter

Considerable discussion ensued regarding the proposed Parking Management Strategy which would utilize a parking pricing system to manage.

CDD Molloy-Previsich then provided information regarding stakeholder workshops and said the intent was for the next two months - January and February – to obtain input and refine this draft and come up with a draft this will be the subject of an EIR. "We intend to conclude the stakeholder meetings in February and bring the new Draft back to the Planning Commission in the middle of March, with the EIR completed and in public hearings in September," CDD Molloy-Previsich said.

Commissioner Mueller asked question of the parking plan, Mark Spencer explaining the proposal of 'global parking' which was fixed with demand generated by commercial and mixed use. "We have recommended lower numbers of parking than what the City will actually need. Now there are hundreds of unused spaces per day." Commissioner Mueller report noted that the report says parking spaces will be short 830 by 2030, with an overall shortfall in terms of office, commercial, retail, and residential. "The numbers in this report don't make sense," Commissioner Mueller said. CDD Molloy-Previsich asked Mr. Spencer to ensure the reference is clarified and the section rearranged for better understanding.

Commissioner Tanda expressed concern that he had been unable to find anything on public transit. "There is need to address local and regional transit," Commissioner Tanda said. CDD Molloy-Previsich responded that more work needs to completed on that issue.

Commissioner Tanda continued by speaking to plans regarding high speed rail and the need for consideration of that. CDD Molloy-Previsich said, "That's a tough one and

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2008

PAGE 10

we will work on the references in chapter 3.”

Commissioner Benich stressed the need to have the plan include the pedestrian multi-mobile requirements, citing the need to look at pathway between the new Courthouse and downtown: maybe look at overpass as we definitely need to look at a route for pedestrian traffic flow. “We need to make it easy for people to get downtown from the Courthouse,” he said.

Mr. Johnston said, “When we look at any successful downtown, it is driven by a significant down population area of residential.” Commissioner Mueller responded that retail must draw from the outside City population. “That is critical for downtown success,” Commissioner Mueller said. “How can we channel retail to have the downtown become flourishing?” he asked. Mr. Johnston replied, “Retail evolves over time. Retailers are looking for success of other retailers in the area. Now, restaurants are successful with many retailers in the downtown owning their own businesses.”

Chair Escobar commented, “When one characterizes other communities that are successful, it appears that some criteria or condition must exist that allows the community build to success and retain success. We need to know how to get into and how sustain that environment. What is it that they are going to want to come here? What can the community offer that will have consumers stop going to other areas? Morgan Hill is very unique but should be able to replicate what other communities are doing to sustain the synergy.”

Commissioner Mueller agreed, saying, “Tell me what we need to do need to drive to a sense of place. The RDA has already spent a lot of money. The RDA is getting ready to do a design for City, and is thinking to put lots of money into it. We must generate a space of retail. We have got to identify how to get to a minimum critical mass to attract retail.” Mr. Johnston agreed, but said, “That is very difficult to do.”

Items discussed in the following discussion included:

- mutually compatible competitors
- need to identify particular area retailers who would be more than willing to connect to existing areas
- downtown leases and ownership(s) are in place
- continuing need for the proper mix for designation shopping
- encourage residents to go to and shop downtown
- difficulty of achieving cohesiveness because of the variety of ownership (significant real estate in downtown is owned by trusts, with much more concern exhibited for income ‘ground zero’ is Third and Monterey)
- retailers will come if can make money
- must have way to have plan generated to ‘sell to retailers’
- need for parking to be integrated; now public parking is located too far away
- flood problem
- probably beneficial to study trends by working with consulting firms that understand what kinds of retailers that they look for in locations
- really saying wants more robust evaluation of what could be done
- need for more in-depth discussion
- study other communities, e.g., Pasadena (several Peninsula cities were mentioned) to see what could be patterned and focused on for the specific plan
- building heights (concern of four stories in Downtown)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2008

PAGE 11

- design and parking to avoid ‘tucked away in a corridor’ perception
- height cautions and exploration
- exemptions of RCDS / concern of ramifications of projects already approved
- proposed ballot measure for 1200 exemption units [Commissioner Mueller said it was not clear that the exemption would be needed at this point]

Commissioner Mueller stressed the need for a ‘clear picture’ of what the City wants for downtown and how to get there. Chair Escobar agreed, saying, “We need residents downtown to have the best retail usage.” More discussion regarding a proposed Density change from head count to floor count ratio occurred.

Commissioner Davenport suggested revisiting the vision statement as the one presented is intensified with good alignment. “This plan appears to be lacking in strategy and how the strategy feeds the vision,” he said.

CDD Molloy-Previsich advised that this is still a land use plan with zoning and regulations. “The specific plan will provide more emphasis on how to more involvement from the public. We are trying to show how public dollars are spent with the public’s involvement and support,” she said. Commissioner Mueller agreed, and said, “In this case, we really are trying to get something built and lay out well enough – we do need the involvement from the public.”

CDD Molloy-Previsich announced the workshop for February 19 when the public can be involved. “Then we can come back to the Planning Commission on March 11 with a revised draft,” she said. Commissioner Mueller said the goals have been based on more of a consensus to get critical core build-out. “We need to work to get consensus and must have input from stakeholders,” Commissioner Mueller said, as he spoke of the urgency in light of having a way of moving the Downtown Competition in order to get plan right.

PM Rowe provided clarification for deadlines for the RCDS Downtown Competition.

Drawing the discussion to conclusion, CDD Molloy-Previsich thanked the Commissioners for their robust attention to this vital matter.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

CDD Molloy-Previsich advised of receipt of a letter from a member of the public who was offering to donate 40 acres for parkland for the City. Commissioner Tanda suggested the matter be referred to staff for review. CDD Molloy-Previsich advised she would check with the City Manager regarding the matter. She was asked to communicate with the letter writer regarding details of the donation.

ADJOURNMENT:

Ascertaining there was no further business to come before the Commissioners at this meeting, Chair Escobar declared the meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2008

PAGE 12

JUDI H. JOHNSON, Minutes Clerk

R:\PLANNING\WP51\MINUTES\PCminutes\2008\01-JANUARY\PC012908.Min.doc